DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 111 715 SO 008 548

AUTHOR	Hahn, Jeffrey W.; Green, Justin J.
TITLE	Political Events and Attitudinal Stability: Watergate and College Students, a Longitudinal Analysis.
SPONS AGENCY	Villanova Univ., Pa.
PUB DATE	75
NOTE	39p.; Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association (San Francisco, California, September 2-5, 1975)
AVAILABLE FROM	Justin J. Green, Political Science Department, Villanova University, Villanova, Pennsylvania 19085 (free)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Attitude Tests; *Changing Attitudes; *Cognitive Measurement; College Students; Data Analysis; Higher Education; Longitudinal Studies; *Political Attitudes; Political Influences; *Political Issues; Political Science; Political Socialization; *Social Science Research
IDENTIFIERS	Nixon (Richard M); Watergate Hearings

ABSTRACT

A short-term cohort design is utilized to examine college students at three different time periods--shortly before the Watergate Committee hearings began, after the hearings ended, and after Nixon's resignation. The purpose of the study is to test the stability of political attitudes under the impact of critical national events. Data for this seven-year study were collected by a questionnaire given on a random sample basis to about 500 college students. It is hypothesized that primary principle attitudes will be more stable than middle range attitudes which in turn will be more stable than topical issue orientations. Secondly, it is hypothesized that the cognitive maps (Showing cognitive dissonance and/or cognitive balance theory) which explain these attitudes will respond to both maturation process and events in the political environment. The results of analysis of variance indicate that, despite maturation, all of the attitudes measured display a very high degree of stability. A Multiple Classification Analysis (MCA) of the data supports the second hypothesis, even though attitudes remain stable. It is suggested that a more complete understanding of attitude formation, change, and their relation to political behavior will depend on the development and use of more complex models than those provided by cognitive maps. (Author/ND)

SEP 1 0 1975

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED111715...

POLITICAL EVENTS AND ATTITUDINAL STABILITY:

WATERGATE AND COLLEGE STUDENTS A LONGITUDINAL ANALYSIS

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Justin Green
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

BY

Jeffrey W. Hann and Justin J. Green
Political Science Department
Villanova University, Villanova, Pa.

SP 005 348

Prepared for delivery at the 1975 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, San Francisco Hilton Hotel, San Francisco, California, September 2-5, 1975. Copyright, 1975, The American Political Science Association.

Our appreciation goes to Mr. Bruce Conforto for his assistance and to Villanova University for its financial support.

ABSTRACT

POLITICAL EVENTS AND ATTITUDINAL STABILITY : WATERGATE AND COLLEGE STUDENTS A LONGITUDINAL ANALYSIS

BY

Jeffrey W. Hahn and Justin J. Green
Political Science Department
Villanova University, Villanova, Pa.

A short term cohort design is utilized to examine college students at three different time periods; shortly before the Watergate Committee hearings began, after the hearings ended and after Nixon's resignation; the purpose being to test the stability of political attitudes under the impact of critical national events. It is hypothesized that primacy principle attitudes will be more stable than "middle range" which in turn will be more stable than topical issue orientations. Further, it is suggested that the cognitive maps which explain these attitudes will respond to both maturation processes and events in the political environment. The results of analysis of variance indicate that despite maturation, important political events on the college campus and Watergate all the attitudes measured display a very high degree of stability. Part of this stability is attributed to the generality of the attitudes tested. Although significant attitude change was not found, a pattern is discerned indicating the attitudes of the most partisan, the best informed and those individuals with the highest media attention were most effected by Watergate.

An MCA analysis of the data supports the second hypothesis. Though attitudes remain stable, underlying explanatory cognitive maps are changed in distinctive ways. A rather strong Watergate effect is noted in the decreasing ability of the predictor variables to predict variation in the dependent attitudes examined.

It is suggested that a more complete understanding of attitude formation, change and their relation to political behavior will depend on the development and use of more complex models than those provided by cognitive dissonance and/or cognitive balance theory.

Underlying the explanation of political behavior is a developmental litany that begins with the notion that early on children are exposed to and learn political orientations [Easton and Dennis (1967); Hess and Torney (1967); Greenstein (1965)]. Somewhere in the age period 17-25 these attitudes crystalize into a political cultural consciousness [Cutler (1975) quoting Lambert (1971)] that remains relatively stable throughout the individual's life span [Dawson and Prewitt (1969); Easton and Dennis (1969)]. These rather stable orientations structure the actor's response to political stimuli; i.e., issues, candidates and other politically relevant decision situations that impinge upon him from his environment. Given these relatively stable orientations, interaction patterns between individual, environment and specific stimuli are reasonably predictable (Smith 1968 and 1975) and an explanatory predictive science of political behavior replete with models, concepts and theories is possible.

In recent years this litany has been exposed to an empirical and methodological critique. Converse (1964) suggests that orientations measured by survey research questions may be "non attitudes" and further that crystalization of orientations into consistent ideological patterns rarely occurs in mass publics. Greenstein and Tarrow (1971) support this view and propose projective techniques as an alternative to survey questions when respondents are children. Cutler (1969); Kleck (1971); Riley (1973); Schaie (1965); Green and Hahn (1974) and other have questioned whether cross sectional data which confounds age, time of measurement (environmental effects) and generation can inform us about attitudinal stability and/or the process by which orientations are acquired. In many cases it has been shown that cross sectional results have concealed rather than revealed accurate trends and relationships. Schaie (1965) and others propose cohort and panel designs or a combination of these with appropriate statistical techniques as a possible methodological solution to the problem of unravelling the process of attitudinal acquisition.

Using these techniques Vaillancourt (1971) finds little test-retest stability in a study of youngsters 9-15. Her results, however, do indicate increasing stability

with age, IQ and social status. Searing, Wright & Rabinowitz (1974) [testing and using cohort techniques on SRC data for ages 21 to 72] examine the primacy principle (orientations are learned early and remain stable) and find that the evidence supporting attitudinal stability is mixed. They note that though attitudes are fairly stable the significance of their results "lies in revealing magnitudes of change far greater than had been anticipated." (Searing, et. al., p. 34). In this same study the authors find that within cohorts socio-political environmental (Zeitgeist) effects are more important than aging effects in explaining attitudinal instability.

Two more questions adhere firmly to the above issues. The first of these is, if attitudes are less stable than originally thought and that is the import of many of the studies mentioned above how then do we account for the relative predictability of some forms of political behavior such as voting and/or participatory behavior? Here Renshon (1974), Knutson (1973) and other scholars of the personality and politics school suggest that early acquired and deeply seated personality orientations are more stable and thus tend to better account for behavior than more transient attitudes and opinions.[1]

The second of these questions is, are all orientations equally as stable or susceptible to change? A model suggested by Weissberg (1974) responds to this question by arguing that "Certain political orientations are learned very early in life and are highly resistant to change while different political orientations may be susceptible to continued modification with recent learning being most important". (Weissberg, 1974, p. 25). He suggests that both the primacy model (early childhood learning though modifiable constrains future learning and adult behavior) and the recency principle (adult learning has greater influence and political relevance) are valid and further that these sandwich an intermediate stage encompassing the late childhood and early adolescent periods. He goes on to affirm the developmental roots of his approach arguing that broader more general attitudes such as basic political attachments, ideological identities, evaluations and consensually held factual knowledge are acquired

during the primacy period. The middle and recency periods are characterized by a growing specificity with orientations toward political participation and general policy preferences learned in the former and positions on specific current issues and candidates acquired during the latter (Weissberg 1974, pp. 27-30).

The above, of course, is only a partial and selective listing of the recent important and critical work. Nor is it suggested that responsible social scientists have claimed the last word for their positions. Those who have supported the importance of early learning have allowed for later changes and urged the study of adult political socialization (Greenstein 1968, p. 553) and those whose work has disclosed both stability and instability have attributed the stable portions to the effectiveness of early socialization (Searing, et. al., 1973, p. 32).

It is in the hope of shedding additional light on these critical political learning questions that this paper is written.

METHODOLOGY

The present study had its origins in the attempt to answer questions about the impact of college on political socialization. The authors are currently engaged in a 7 year longitudinal study on how college effects political learning. At the time of writing, the "3rd wave" of data has been collected at a relatively small (5,500 full time undergraduates) liberal arts university near Philadelphia. Attitudinal, behavioral and demographic data has been collected annually by means of a questionnaire administered to a random sample of 400-500 students. In addition, we plan in the future to administer personality tests to a random sub-sample of students in an effort to obtain information about and control for this important, but until recently overlooked variable.[2] As can be seen from the outline of the project indicated in Figure 1, the proposed method of investigation will allow the authors to compare longitudinal (cohort) with cross-sectional analyses of change during college as well as to reinterview students several years after their graduation.

Figure 1 - A Model of The College as an Agent of Socialization Project

		Time of Analysis			
		T_1 (March 1973)	T_2 (Nov. 73)	T_3 (Nov. 74)	T_4 (Nov. 75)
Approximate Year of Birth as Represented by Year of Graduation	73	Senior	Graduate (1st yr)	Grad (2 yr)	Grad (3 yr)
	74	Junior	Senior	Grad (1st yr)	Grad (2 yr)
	75	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Grad (1 yr)
	76	Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior
	77	-	Freshman	Sophomore	Junior
	78	-	-	Freshman	Sophomore
	79	-	-	-	Freshman

In Figure 1, the rows represent the developmental paths of our cohort groups labeled Class of 73 through 79. There are as well four cross-sectional pictures of change (these are numbered T_1 through T_4. Generational change and/or the changing recruitment patterns of freshmen is also available. This is represented both by the difference between rows and by the differences between freshmen at T_1, T_2, T_3 and T_4. It is hoped that the multi-dimensional approach outlined above will enable us to draw firmer conclusions about the impact of the college experience on political learning than the unidimensional approach taken by most of the studies in existing college-socialization literature.[3]

We are aware, however, that within this design the college experience may not be the only effective environmental influence. Events from the larger political world may be of greater importance in explaining variations in political orientations. At the same time we recognized that the process of maturation may also account for attitudinal change. We believe we can partially separate out the relative effect of those three factors by segacious use of a variety of statistical techniques. These will be discussed below.

The above discussion makes clear that originally it was our intention to measure only the socialization effect of college. The fortuitous timing of our first three samples suggested that we could pursue our original objectives and also investigate longitudinally the effect of the developing Watergate crises on the stability of college students' political orientations.

Not only were the times of measurement vis-a-vis Watergate fortuitous but if Lambert (1971) (quoted above) is correct so is the sample. If crystallization of political consciousness occurs during the age period 17-25 college students should be particularly sensitive to massive governmental crises. We have only to recall the series of events which took place on American college campuses during the Vietnam War years (1965 to 1972) to find intuitive support for this statement.

Since we will be examining the Zeitgeist (environmental effect) it is important to know what political events local as well as national were taking place at the times we were sampling our population. The latter statement points to the fact that in investigating the Zeitgeist effect we cannot confine ourselves only to happenings in the national arena. Inevitably these must be confounded by events taking place in the individual's immediate social milieu. Unfortunately at this time we have no theories which suggest which of these arenas has the greater effect, therefore we cannot assume that national events are more critical than local. Hopefully by employing college predictor variables in our multivariate analysis we can begin to resolve this dilemma.

Our first survey (T_1) was taken in early March of 1973. On the national scene Nixon's popularity was high. He had won the presidency by a large margin, the Xmas bombings of Hanoi were supported by a majority of the public, "peace with honor" had come to Vietnam and though the protective Watergate coverup was beginning to show cracks at this point in time the public was relatively unconcerned. On this college's campus, however, for the first time in many years students were showing signs of political activity. A radical student party had organized itself to contest the elections for student government and its platforms suggested that it would confront the University Administration squarely and strongly on those issues (particularly the question of parietals) which concerned many of the college's students.

The second survey was taken in November 1973. The Ervin Committee hearings had ended and though the "smoking gun" was yet to be found suspicion about Watergate and

the effects of the "Saturday Night Massacre" were topics that surfaced frequently in people's conversations. On this particular campus, however, all was optimism. The radical student party had swept the field in April 1973's election and was preparing to confront the University with a set of student demands and the University's early reactions gave students cause for optimism.

The third survey was taken in November 1974. Nixon had resigned, been pardoned by President Ford and the nation's economic problems were coming to the fore as the critical issue of the day. On our test campus all was gloom. In the Spring of 1974 students had occupied the administration building. The Administration had struck back, expelled many of the student leaders and rejected outright student demands for change. By and large most students had taken a more passive orientation toward University politics.

The above account would suggest that our respondents were being exposed to national and local events that were contradictory and thus their mutual effect might be self cancelling. This possibility must be taken into account when we examine our data.

In the best of all worlds a fourth sample taken in April 1972 would have been most helpful. An earlier start could have assured us that our initial measurement was uncontaminated by either early Watergate information, the failure of the McGovern campaign, or the Xmas bombings of November 1973. Lacking this measurement we cannot be totally confident that the data collected at T_1 is free of Watergate contamination.

ATTITUDES

In order to test Weissberg's argument (page 2), we will present data on the following political orientations:

Primacy Model - Here we will be examining a three question version of the SRC efficacy scale. During the three periods of measurement the scale had minimum coefficients of reproducability and stability of .80 and .47 respectively. Efficacy, it has been argued, is one of those attitudes which are learned early and are highly resistant to change. Rotter's (1966) I-E Personality Scale, used in measuring the

dimension - internal/external control has questions which at least on the surface seem to be tapping a dimension similar to that tapped by the SRC efficacy scale. As far as stability, Weissberg (1975) has shown that levels of efficacy are unresponsive to either satisfactory or unsatisfactory environmental outcomes. In addition to efficacy we will be looking at Party I.D. Here we have used the SRC Seven category Strong Democrat to Strong Republican scale.

Middle Stage Model - Here we will be examining two dimensions. The first of these is a three question version of a liberal/conservative scale adopted and used by Green (1973) for an earlier study. This scale is designed to measure the degree to which people either favor or oppose change. Thus it defines a conservative as one who perceives change as unnecessary, prefers things the way they are rather than the way they might be and sees the past rather than the future as the "best" time. Second, we will be examining a Peer Identity scale created for this research which attempts to tap the degree to which a young person identifies with and takes his behavioral cues from his peers rather than family, professors or other individual or groups in his social milieu. We feel this may be particularly useful in separating national political events from local ones. Both the L/C and Peer ID scale were exposed to Gutman procedures and neither dropped below minimal acceptable criteria for reproducibility and scalability.

Recency Model - To test this model we will examine the respondent's presidential preference in 1972. Because this is an ongoing research and each succeeding cohort is therefore less likely to have been old enough to vote in 1972 we deliberately did not ask who respondents had voted for. Thus it is probable that in the classes of "74" and "75" we are tapping a combination of behavior and/or attitudes whereas in the classes of "76", "77" and "78's" Freshmen we are measuring a remembered opinion rather than a behavior.

THE DATA

On the basis of the earlier theoretical discussion we plan to test the following hypotheses:

1. Irregardless of the degree of attitudinal stability/instability displayed in this sample, primacy principle attitudes will be more stable than middle range attitudes which in turn will be more stable than orientations classified under the recency principle.

2. We would expect that the attitudes of individuals displaying the strongest partisanship are more likely to be stable while those more exposed to media and having more information are more likely to change.

3. We would expect that if orientations towards a political object remain stable despite a change in the valence of the information received about the political object some other element(s) of the explanatory model will be revised in order to restore the model's balance.

4. We would expect that irregardless of either the degree of attitudinal stability/instability displayed by our cohorts or of the source of environmental pressure to change, the underlying explanatory patterns of individuals' orientations will vary.

In order to test the significance of intra-cohort attitudinal variation we are using analysis of variance. By manipulating the data we can examine the significance of changes across all three times of analysis or between any two consecutive periods. Further, by examining sub-populations of each cohort, i.e., strong partisan vs. weak, Republicans vs. Democrats, those with high media exposure vs. those with low, etc., we may discover the patterning of attitudinal stability/instability. If, however, local and national Zeitgeist effects are cancelling each other or the primacy principle is dominant, analysis of variance which accounts for intra-cohort variation will reveal little significant change.

Multiple Classification Analysis (MCA) (Andrews, Morgan and Sonquist, 1967) a multivariate statistical technique which unlike Regression Analysis makes few assumptions about the orderliness or the linearity of data will be employed to examine the patterns of causation which account for attitudinal variation within each time frame

of each cohort. We will be looking at two MCA statistics: 1) The Beta coefficients which disclose the intra-cohort changing patterns of attitude causation and 2) R^2 which will indicate the changing degree to which we can predict any attitude at time T_1, T_2, or T_3.

Throughout the examination of the data that follows the reader should note that as we suggested earlier, based on our cohort methods,[4] we find that college classes are unalike. Inter-cohort differences in mean scores on our attitudinal dimensions, in degree of stability/instability and on direction of change are the rule rather than the exception. This is not to say that no patterns exist but rather to draw attention to the fact that at least among this sample, patterns of self recruitment, changing University recruitment criteria, chance and generational variation combine to generate Freshman classes that though they somewhat resemble each other are in no sense of the word "identical". We shall examine data supporting these statements below.

The Results of Analysis of Variance

Tables 1A through 1E tabulate the results of an analysis variance performed on each of our attitudinal dimensions, Efficacy, Liberalism/Conservatism, Party ID, Peer ID and Candidate Preference in "72" for each of our cohorts; the classes of "74", "75", "76" and "77". In addition we have examined several sub populations: Variation in Information Level [Cognition (Cog)], Attention to Radio and TV News [Media Attention (Med Att)], Partisanship [Strong Democrats, Non-Partisan, Strong Republicans (Dem Part, Non Part, Rep Part)], Party Loyalty [Democratic -- Independent and Republican (Dems, Inds Reps)] and Candidate Preferred in "72" [McGovern, Nixon (McG, Nix)] for each of our three year cohorts the classes of "75" and "76". We have provided the "F" ratio and significance level across all three time periods and also the "F" ratio where it was significant at the .05 level across either $T_1 - T_2$ or $T_2 - T_3$.

A thorough look at all these figures provides strong support for either of two arguments. The first of these is that the primacy theorists are indeed correct. Most politically relevant orientations are learned early in life and remain relatively stable thereafter. Over the three year span of our research despite earth shaking events

in the national arena, the continued maturation of our college students, their exposure to a new social environment, new peers, new attitudes and new information during a particularly exciting period of campus life, there are few significant changes in this group's political orientations. Not even the recency principle holds up in this sample. Preference in "72" which according to recency theory is the likeliest candidate for instability is at least as stable as efficacy which according to the primacy principle should be least likely to vary. Only one significant variation in Party ID occurred and perhaps rather unexpectedly and unexplainably Peer ID increased significantly in the classes of "74" and "76".

The second of these arguments is one we have mentioned earlier; the rather strong possibility that national and local events of a contradictory nature are self cancelling and what remains are the attitudinal sets our respondents had before all these experiences occurred.

Given these overall tendencies towards stability perhaps a closer look at the variations will give us a better sense of what might be occurring. Although only 3 of the changes on Table 1A (Efficacy) are significant (Class of "76", Med Cog T_1 to T_3 and class of "75" Nixon and McGovern Supporters, T_1 to T_2) the patterns of change are worth noting. In both cohorts, "75" and "76", those with high levels of information, media attention, strong Democratic partisanship and Democrats, Independents and McGovern supporters (excluding McGovern supporters in "76") have lower levels of efficacy at time T_2 followed by an increase at time T_3. Those with middle levels of information, low media attention, non partisan, Republican partisanship and Nixon supporters show a steadily rising level of efficacy. Only those respondents with low levels of information show a steady decrease in efficacy.

Although these patterns are less clear and stable in the case of Liberalism/Conservatism, Party & Peer ID they nevertheless persist to some degree. In general stronger partisans with higher information and greater media attention display the broken line tending either down or up at T_2 and returning to near T_1 levels at T_3.

Among the non partisans, Republican Partisans or those with lower media attention or less information, the direction of change is either continously up or down or follows an up-down pattern that is the reverse of the former group.

The fact that the figures on which these patterns are based are non significant makes theorizing about this data quite difficult. In order to try and make sense of these we tried several techniques including multi-dimensional cross tabulations and regression analysis on each of our cohorts. No clear consistent explanatory pattern emerged. In some cases information played the dominant explanatory role, in others it was partisanship or media attention. Clearly partisanship, information and media attention are operant factors but at this point in our research we are unable to order them.

Although our analysis of variance technique which measures the significance of intra-cohort change has indicated high stability it is possible that our Multiple Classification Analysis (MCA) which discloses the explanatory patterns of the variance at each time (T_1 through T_3) for each cohort may provide us with more information and understanding. Tables 2 (A through D) through 5 (A through D) trace the changing explanatory patterns for each attitudinal dimension for Cohorts "75", "76" and "77". In addition we examine generational difference (or in our case more likely the shifting patterns of admission criteria) by comparing the explanatory patterns for each of three successive Freshman classes ("76", "77" and "78"). At the top of each table is the cohort label followed by the dependent variable being examined. Next we indicate the time of examination T_1 through T_3 the college class at that time, (Freshman, Sophomore, Junior or Senior) and the mean score for that class along the dimension being examined. Along the left hand column are the List of Predictor variables. The reader should note that for Freshman we have used a shorter list of predictors. Our rationale here is that Freshmen newly arrived on campus have not been exposed to our collegiate variables long enough to be affected by them. One other variation needs to be commented upon. We have included Parental Social Trust at times T_2 and T_3 and excluded it from time T_1. The reason for this exclusion is that the scale was changed after the first

survey and consequently we would not be measuring the same dimension that exists at T_2 and T_3. This variable, which meets all Guttman criteria, measures the degree to which parents indicate to their children whether the developing child's social environment is something to be feared or trusted.[5]

The coefficients in each column are Beta's. These are ideally designed for our purpose. Beta does not indicate the association between a predictor and the dependent variable but rather the Beta list indicates the ranking of each predictor in terms of its ability to predict the dependent variable after adjusting for the effects of all other predictors. Beta, however, does not give the % of variance explained. At the bottom of each column is "R^2". This figure is the proportion of the total variance in the dependent variable explained by all the predictors taken together and corrected for the degrees of freedom. By comparing columns (we have numbered and put in parenthesis next to the Beta score the first four predictors in order of their importance) we can examine the changing patterns of causation and relative ability of these patterns to predict variation in the dependent variable. It is our thesis, which we will discuss more fully below that unmeasured environmental effects can be thought of as missing predictors and thus as a given predictor list loses its predictive ability it is due to something occurring in the social environment. In our case since we are in part accounting for the college effect (predictors 10-13) we believe Watergate is that environmental event.

The last table in this series, Table 6, indicates the "R^2" relationships for each of our dimensions, for each of our cohorts at each time (T_1 - T_2 - T_3) they were measured.

An examination of the MCA tables makes it clear that although the patterns which explain the dependent variable are not identical for any two cohorts or any dependent variables there are certain similarities. The most important of these is that there are startling alterations in the explanatory patterns of the predictor variables for all cohorts for all orientations from times T_1 to T_2 and from T_2 to T_3 and it is these alterations we will discuss below.

Before proceeding to this examination we should note that Predictors 1-9 have been discussed elsewhere or their titles are self explanatory. It is necessary, however, to explain what the collegiate predictors 10-13 were designed to measure. By division we mean, is the student enrolled in the college of Liberal Arts, Engineering, Commerce and Finance or Nursing. These divisions seem to effect students' lives when they are Sophomores and become more meaningful in their Junior and Senior years. We asked students whether they lived; on campus, off campus - either alone or with other students - or at home with parents or relatives. Our thinking was that on the one hand students who go on living at home have parentally acquired attitudes, continually reinforced despite their exposure to all that goes on in the college environment. On the other hand given the fact that the college we are examining continues to act in "Loco-parentis" the kind of student who chooses to live off campus would be quite different from those who live in dormitories. We asked students about their willingness to take part in a public demonstration on this campus if it concerned an issue important to students. At their Institution this behavior involves the risk of expulsion thus we feel we are measuring some degree of commitment to anomic forms of political activity. Finally we asked the student to subjectively rank the faculty on a Liberal/Conservative scale. Our reasoning here was that students' views might be linked to their perceptions of the faculties' point of view.

EFFICACY

An examination of the classes of "75" and "76" (Tables 2A and 2B) at T_1 (Pre-Watergate) reveals that although the explanatory patterns for each cohort are somewhat different they seem to revolve around the same variables SES, Cognition, Liberalism/Conservatism and Party ID. In the case of the class of "75", because we are examining Sophomores, college variables begin to enter the explanatory picture. Here division is the college predictor. A pattern similar to that of "76's" Freshmen continues to hold for Freshman at T_2 (Class of "77" - Table 2C) except that using

the same list of predictors our ability to predict efficacy has decreased sharply. As discussed earlier we attribute this decreasing predictive ability to a missing predictor, the Watergate effect, that is operant at "T_2."

When we examine time T_2 for the class of "75" and "76" (Tables 2A and 2B) we notice important changes in the patterning of predictors particularly for "75's" Juniors. The Sophomores of "76" change less than the Juniors of "75" but they, like the Freshmen of "77", also show the effects of Watergate; our ability to predict their efficacy is Zero. Only for "75's" Juniors can we increasingly predict efficacy. This was not unexpected. The Juniors of "75" were this University's activist class. They provided the leadership and the mass support for the radical student party mentioned above. They led the drive for parietals and it was they who became most disillusioned by the time they became Seniors at time T_3. We would, therefore, expect the efficacy level of this class despite Watergate to become more predictable at T_2. This is what occurs and as might have been anticipated <u>the most important variable in predicting efficacy is the willingness of "75's" Juniors to participate in a student demonstration</u>.

At T_3 the effect of Watergate has lessened and as a result our ability to predict efficacy increases amongst "76's" Juniors and "77's" Sophomores although once again the explanatory patterns continue to change as students mature and other social forces influence their lives. As expected our "75" Seniors as a result of their failures to achieve their activist goals become less predictable.

It would appear that the class most shattered by Watergate is "78's" Freshmen. Even though Watergate has ended we are unable to predict either their efficacy or as we shall see below their Liberalism/Conservatism.

<u>LIBERALISM/CONSERVATISM</u>

This dimension behaves much like efficacy. The pattern of causation among Freshmen "76" (Table 3B) uninfluenced by Watergate is familiar to political scientists', L/C variation is a function of Party ID, SES and Father's Party ID. The Pre-Watergate Sophomores of "75" (Table 3A), show the effect of the college influences that made

them an activist class. The two strongest predictors of "75's" Sophomores are faculty L/C (in this case a high correlation between student liberals and perception of the faculty as liberal) and, once again, their willingness to participate in anomic political behavior. The Freshmen at "T_2" (Table 3C) (the Class of "77") are effected by Watergate in two ways. In the first of these media attention has become an important predictor and in the second we can no longer predict any of the variation in levels of Liberalism/Conservatism. The latter effect holds for Juniors and is almost as true for the Sophomores at T_2. Once again we suggest that the missing predictor, Watergate, accounts for our failure to predict L/C. This suggestion is supported when we examine Seniors, Juniors and Sophomores at T_3 (Tables 3A, 3B and 3C). In all three cases Watergate's conclusion allows us to better predict, albeit to a varying degree, the liberal-conservative dimension. The lone exception to this pattern is, as mentioned earlier "78's" Freshmen (Table 3D).

PARTY ID

Of all the attitudinal dimensions in the political science literature, Party ID is generally considered not only the most stable but also the most predictable. It is learned early, the numbers of young people expressing an identity increases with age and its relationship to social background factors - Father's Party ID, SES, etc. and other attitudes is thought to be well understood. Our MCA analysis provides support for these views. An examination of each of our Freshman classes (Table 4D) indicates a relatively stable pattern of predictors at all three times of measurement. Family Factors, Father's Party ID, SES and the addition of Parental Social Trust in the case of "78's" Freshmen are most important in explaining the Party ID of newly entered Freshmen. This pattern holds despite the fact that the party loyalties of each group vary significantly. Moreover, in each of our cohorts, Party ID is stable and increasingly predictable. There is no obvious Watergate effect here. Though the lower levels of predictability at T_1 are probably attributable to normal development patterns, it is possible that the large Nixon majority in "72" might be the missing predictor in

explaining these lower levels. Since at this time we have not included preference in "72" on our predictor list we cannot be sure that this is the case.

Though our analysis provides support for traditional explanations of Party ID and its stability, the cognitive map that explains Party ID does shift. Our data suggests that though Father's Party ID remains an important source of explanation, other elements in the map change considerably. In the cohorts "75" and "77" college factors are important. In "76", however, it is a combination of Peer Group loyalties and college factors which take precedence over other predictors.

PREFERENCE IN "72"

Perhaps the way we worded our question accounts for the fact that there is little change in our respondent's candidate preferences in "72". We asked our sample to indicate their preferences and they maintained their positions despite disparaging information about Nixon which might have encouraged them to dissimulate. If we had asked "Who do you think was the best candidate in "72" we suspect our results would have displayed greater volitility. Our research, however, was not designed to measure a specific environmental effect and the preference question seemed better able to catch long term opinion change.

Nevertheless our MCA analysis discloses a strong Watergate influence. One that holds for all cohorts and all attitudinal dimensions and persists through both T_2 and T_3. Our predictor list becomes less efficient in predicting preference in "72" for each successive time period. As in the case of our other dimensions not only are we unable to predict as well but the underlying patterns of explanation vary considerably and at this point in our research rather inexplicably.

THE PREDICTABILITY TABLE

Table 6, which combines the MCA "R^2's" for each cohort for each attitudinal dimension, summarizes the argument for a Watergate effect which we have made above. The Efficacy and Liberal/Conservative dimensions decrease at T_2 and return to near previous levels at T_3. Candidate Preference in "72", however, continuously decreases in predictability. Only Party ID deviates from this pattern and is increasingly predictable

from T_1, to T_3. Even the generation effect as measured by consecutive Freshman classes (Freshman "76", Freshman "77", Freshman "78") demonstrates a Watergate influence paralleling that of our cohorts.

CONCLUSIONS

It is tempting when considering vast amounts of new data to rethink the whole field of political behavior. When the results deal with attitudinal formation, stability and the relationship of these to political choices the temptation is magnified. It is our intention to strongly resist this temptation. Thus our conclusions, despite all this data, are quite modest.

Originally we hypothesized that regardless of the degree of stability/instability, orientations would show less stability as we moved from the primacy principle through the middle range to the recency principle; from broad orientations to the specific. Perhaps because none of the orientations we measured were specific enough all of the attitudes we tested were stable regardless whether we thought them to be general or specific.

We hypothesized that the attitudes of those most partisan would be least likely to change in response to Watergate. This seems to have been the case only for Republican partisans. We also thought that information and media contact would effect stability. Our results, though not significant, suggest that this is true but we are unable to establish an explanatory pattern that would relate these factors to attitudinal change.

We suggested that balance theory might explain attitudinal change in the triadic relationship between individual, orientation and object. Our MCA analysis, however, would suggest that balance theory as presently constituted is not elaborate enough to cope with the complex events that take place within the minds of our respondents. Developmental theories that would expand on Piaget's work would seem more appropriate. Perhaps the best way to view this phenomena is to think of the inter relationships of attitudes, background factors, information, etc. as a cognitive map providing complex

sets of alternative explanatory paths for any orientation (in this case any attitude under examination). Although the orientation remains relatively stable the effects of maturation, the nearby social environment (college peer groups, etc.) and critical events taking place in the national political arenas cause a shift in the paths that lead to each orientation. Thus at any given time an individual's map represents the outcomes of his specific socialization process. The paths on the map, however, undergo a continuous sorting, changing and re-sorting in the light of new experience and the impact of external environmental events.[6]

Specifically, in our cohorts, attitudes have remained relatively stable. Over the three year examination period neither deeply buried attitudinal or personality factors, middle range orientations nor recently acquired issue positions, to the degree we were able to measure them, have changed significantly. The cognitive pathways, i.e., predictor lists that lead to these positions have, however, undergone frequent and meaningful revisions. Though we believe that these pattern changes can eventually be categorized and modelled, we have not, outside of a few rather casual observations, made any attempt to do so here.

Conventional wisdom and some research [Entman, Prothro and Sharp (1974); Lupfer and Kenny (1974); Garrett (1974); McClain (1974)] have suggested that Watergate has had a major effect on the political attitudes of young people. Our results support neither the conventional wisdom or other research results. Not that we have not found a Watergate effect. We have and it is a strong one. In this sample, however, Watergate is not significantly changing peoples' orientations. Rather it has become a part of the cognitive map which explains those orientations. As we have noted, Watergate acts like a missing predictor variable in our MCA analysis and its effect is to sharply decrease the ability of the cognitive maps as represented by our predictor lists to predict the attitudes of our sample. These lists as indicated by satisfactory "R^2's" were quite adequate before the sequence of events known as Watergate took place.

Paradoxically we have at the same time too much information and too little. We believe that our long interview form designed to procure a great deal of general rather

than specific information tends to reduce the "non attitude" (Responses stimulated by questions where no previous attitude had existed) effect. At the same time the lack of specificity of the questions allows us to measure attitudes without forcing the respondents into a reality testing situation in which only the strongest believers could avoid changing their responses.[7] The long term nature of our project, however, makes it difficult to devise topical questions which will retain their validity over a period of 5 to 7 years.

The numbers of variables we are measuring make the testing of balance models of attitude change difficult if not impossible. The problem as indicated by our MCA analysis is that respondents elusively change their patterns of attitude organization rather than simply changing an orientation to rebalance a triadic relationship. We feel this more complex view is more closely attuned to the reality of attitudinal/behavioral formation and change.

TABLE # 1A

ATTITUDE	SUB POPULATION	COHORT	T_1	F BET	T_2	F BET	T_3	"F" Across T_1 T_2 T_3	Sig. Level
EFFICACY	-	Class of 74	2.26	-	2.22			.09	NS
	-	" " 75	2.10	-	2.12		2.22	.53	"
	-	" " 76	2.08	-	2.09		2.27	1.54	"
	-	" " 77	-	-	2.08		2.06	.04	"
	Cog. High	" " 75	2.26		2.16		2.28	.37	"
	" Med	" " "	1.88		2.11		2.17	.95	"
	" Low	" " "	2.00		1.90		1.66	.09	"
	" High	Class 76	2.25		2.09		2.23	.73	"
	" Med	" " "	1.80		2.07		2.38	3.18	$p < .05$
	" Low	" " "	2.75		2.22		2.14	.79	NS
	Media Att High	" " 75	2.14		2.13		2.14	.003	"
	Media Att Low	" " 75	2.03		2.09		2.38	1.39	"
	Media Att High	" " 76	2.14		2.14		2.26	.41	"
	Media Att Low	" " 76	1.90		2.01		2.27	1.66	"
	Dem Partisan	" " 75	2.60		2.00		2.00	2.12	"
	Non Partisan	" " 75	2.06		2.16		2.28	1.12	"
	Rep Partisan	" " 75	1.80		2.25		2.67	1.05	NS
	Dem Partissan	" " 76	2.53		2.38		2.43	.16	NS
	Non Partisan	" " 76	1.96		2.07		2.21	1.29	NS
	Rep Partisan	" " 76	2.33		2.60		3.00	1.93	NS
	Dems	" " 75	2.19		2.06		2.31	1.05	NS
	Inds	" " "	2.33		2.33		2.20	.15	"
	Reps	" " "	1.88		2.03		2.09	.41	"
	Dems	" " 76	2.19		2.07		2.26	.62	"
	Inds	" " "	2.00		1.92		2.44	1.73	"
	Reps	" " "	1.90		2.19		2.31	1.84	"
	Supported Nixon 72	" " 75	1.90	3.34	2.20		2.22	2.35	"
	Supported McGovern 72	" " 75	2.40	3.54	2.03		2.37	2.29	"
	Supported Nixon 72	" " 76	2.12	-	2.13		2.30	.12	"
	Supported McGovern 72	" " 76	2.00	-	2.18		2.31	1.02	"

Table # 1B

ATTITUDE	SUB POPULATION	COHORT	T_1	F BET	T_2	F BET	T_3	"F" Across T_1 T_2 T_3	Sig Level
L/C		Class 74	1.37		1.35			.03	NS
		" 75	1.42		1.33		1.33	.28	NS
		" 76	1.41		1.38		1.27	.85	NS
		" 77			1.44		1.39	.35	NS
	Cog. High	Class 75	1.41		1.26		1.38	.51	NS
	Cog. Med	" "	1.52		1.45		1.25	1.31	NS
	Cog. Low	" "	.83	5.9	1.60		1.33	2.99	NS
	Cog. High	Class 76	1.43		1.28		1.31	.44	NS
	Cog. Med	" "	1.37		1.47		1.23	.79	NS
	Cog. Low	" "	1.50		1.89	15.1	1.00	6.80	$p < .01$
	Media High	Class 75	1.43		1.45		1.36	.20	NS
	Media Low	" "	1.38	-	1.29	-	1.26	.28	NS
	Media High	Class 76	1.48		1.33		1.26	1.09	"
	Media Low	" "	1.19	5.09	1.47	4.62	1.28	1.58	"
	Dem Partisan	Class 75	1.20		1.36		1.00	.23	NS
	Non Partisan	" 75	1.80		2.00		2.33	1.64	NS
	Rep Partisan	" 75	1.44		1.36		1.29	.65	NS
	Dem Partisan	Class 76	1.40		1.58		1.16	1.25	NS
	Non Partisan	" 76	1.45		1.39		1.36	.20	NS
	Rep Partisan	" 76	1.00		1.40		1.50	.50	NS
	Dem	Class 75	1.16		1.38		1.31	1.00	NS
	Ind	" "	1.44		1.54	4.08	1.06	2.00	NS
	Rep	" "	1.68	6.5	1.24		1.55	3.43	$p < .05$
	Dem	Class 76	1.37		1.41		1.27	.33	NS
	Ind	" "	1.35		1.42		1.44	.07	NS
	Rep	" "	1.55		1.33		1.31	.93	NS
	Nixon	Class 75	1.71	3.7	1.44		1.49	2.19	NS
	McGovern	" "	1.11		1.28		1.33	.53	NS
	Nixon	Class 76	1.52	4.09	1.73	4.11	1.50	.18	NS
	McGovern	" "	1.29		1.36		1.02	2.31	NS

TABLE # 1C

ATTITUDE	SUB POPULATION	COHORT	T_1	F BET	T_2	F BET	T_3	"F" Across T_1 T_2 T_3	Sig. Level
PARTY ID		Class 74	2.85	5.69	2.12			5.69	p < 05
		Class 75	2.83		2.69		2.69	.19	N.S.
		Class 76	2.53		2.60		2.93	1.08	N.S.
		Class 77			3.18		3.06	.28	N.S.
	Cog. High	Class 75	2.72	3.33	2.10	4.16	2.86	2.47	N.S.
	Cog. Med	" "	2.86		3.18	4.32	2.35	1.99	N.S.
	Cog. Low	" "	3.66		3.50		3.00	.15	N.S.
	Cog. High	Class 76	2.41		2.43		2.66	.29	N.S.
	Cog. Med	" "	2.77		2.87		3.58	1.39	N.S.
	Cog. Low	" "	1.50		2.67		3.00	.44	N.S.
	Media High	Class 75	2.67		2.41		2.69	.39	N.S.
	Media Low	" "	3.16		2.98		2.69	.50	N.S.
	Media High	Class 76	2.70		2.64		2.66	.01	N.S.
	Media Low	" "	2.04		2.52		3.30	3.09	.05
	Nixon	Class 75	3.75		3.30		3.10	1.83	N.S.
	McGovern	" "	1.71		1.63		2.03	.69	N.S.
	Nixon	Class 76	3.19		3.41		3.65	.76	N.S.
	McGovern	" "	1.71		1.56		1.69	.08	N.S.

TABLE # 1D

ATTITUDE	SUB POPULATION	COHORT	T_1	F BET	T_2	F BET	T_3	"F" Across T_1 T_2 T_3	Sig. Level
PEER TD		Class of 74	2.48	3.79	2.19			3.79	p <.05
		" " 75	2.16		2.01		2.26	1.39	NS
		" " 76	1.99		2.01		2.29	3.04	p <.05
		" " 77			2.27		2.23	.14	NS
	Cog. High	" " 75	2.20		2.06		2.42	1.78	NS
	Cog. Med	" " "	2.00		1.88		2.03	.19	NS
	Cog. Low	" " "	2.67		2.30		1.67	.73	NS
	Cog. High	" " 76	1.90		2.07		2.30	2.56	NS
	Cog. Med	" " 76	2.14		1.96		2.31	1.05	NS
	Cog. Low	" " "	1.50		1.78		2.14	.38	NS
	Media Att High	" " 75	2.07		1.94		2.21	.99	NS
	Low	" " 75	2.32		2.07		2.34	.79	NS
	Media Att High	" " 76	1.91		1.85	12.31	2.35	4.56	p < .01
	Low	" " 76	2.19		2.22		2.20	.02	NS
	Partisan Dem	" " 75	2.10		1.54		1.33	1.42	NS
	Non Partisan	" " 75	2.08		2.08		2.31	1.11	NS
	Partisan Rep	" " 75	2.00		1.50		2.00	.20	NS
	Partisan Dem	" " 76	2.60		2.16		2.42	.65	NS
	Non Partisan	" " 76	1.87		1.96		2.34	4.45	p < .05
	Partisan Rep	" " 76	2.33		1.80		2.00	.32	NS
	Dems	" " 75	2.12		1.96		2.43	2.41	Close NS
	Inds	" " 75	2.17		2.50		1.87	2.83	Close NS
	Reps	" " 75	2.21		1.73		2.23	1.96	Close NS
	Dems	" " 76	1.95		1.93		2.40	3.75	p < .05
	Inds	" " 76	2.41		2.21		2.00	.74	NS
	Reps	" " 76	1.75		2.00		2.35	2.50	Close NS
	Nixon in 72	" " 75	1.98		1.95		2.17	.63	NS
	McGovern in 72	" " 75	2.21		2.09		2.40	.07	NS
	Nixon in 72	" " 76	1.88		2.01		2.30	2.31	Close NS
	McGovern in 72	" " 76	2.08		1.96		2.28	1.24	NS
		00026							

TABLE # 1E

ATTITUDE	SUB POPULATION	COHORTS	T_1	F BET	T_2	F BET	T_3	"F" Across T_1 T_2 T_3	Sig. Level
PREFERENCE		Class 74	.46	.28	.42			.28	N.S.
IN 72		Class 75	.57		.66		.57	1.06	N.S.
		Class 76	.55		.66		.57	.31	N.S.
		Class 77			.67		.60	1.35	N.S.
	Cog. High	Class 75	.65		.56		.50	.77	N.S.
	Cog. Med	" "	.45		.78		.68	4.60	.05
	Cog. Low	" "	.80		.67		1.0	.46	N.S.
	Cog. High	Class 76	.60		.61		.54	.32	N.S.
	Cog. Med	" "	.50		.59		.63	.50	N.S.
	Cog. Low	" "	.50		.63		.50	.23	N.S.
	Media TV High	Class 75	.54		.62		.55	.33	N.S.
	Media TV Low	" "	.62		.71		.62	.43	N.S.
	Media TV High	Class 76	.65		.61		.55	.54	N.S.
	Media TV Low	" "	.29		.59		.57	3.03	.05
	Partisan S. Dem	Class 75	.20		.27		.66	1.2	N.S.
	Non Partisan	" "	.58		.70		.56	1.8	N.S.
	Partisan S. Rep	" "	1.00		1.0		1.0	0	N.S.
	Partisan S. Dem	Class 76	.20		.25		.08	.57	N.S.
	Non Partisan	" "	.61		.64		.64	.06	N.S.
	Partisan S. Rep	" "	.67		1.0		.75	.79	N.S.
	Dem	Class 75	.28		.42		.42	1.13	N.S.
	Ind	" "	.52		.78		.67	1.42	N.S.
	Rep	" "	.93		.90		.85	.53	N.S.
	Dem	Class 76	.35		.36		.27	.47	N.S.
	Ind	" "	.67		.80		.90	.97	N.S.
	Rep	" "	.90		.91		.85	.28	N.S.

MULTIPLE CLASSIFICATION BY COHORT

Dependent Variable: EFFICACY

Table # 2A Cohort: Class of "75" Predictor List	T_1 Soph(2.10)	T_2 Jr (2.12)	T_3 Sr(2.22)	Table # 2B Cohort: Class of "76" T_1 Fr(2.08)	T_2 Soph(2.09)	T_3 Jr(2.27)
1. Media Attention	.12	.18	.33	.35	.20	.13
2. Father's Party Identification	.26	.24	.25	.29	.62 (1)	.58 (3)
3. Socio-economic Status of Respondent's Family	.43 (4)	.53 (2)	.76 (1)	.38 (4)	35 (4)	.27
4. Political Information (Cognition	.67 (1)	.43	.27	.45 (2)	.38 (3)	.56 (4)
5. Liberal/Conservativeness	.24	.33	.28	.52 (1)	.16	.38
6. Efficacy	-	-	-	-	-	-
7. Peer Identification	.34	.34	.21	.20	.21	.42
8. Respondent's Party ID	.52 (3)	.46 (3)	.47 (2)	.42 (3)	.41 (2)	.38
9. Parental Social Trust	-	.39	.46 (3)	-	.30	.76 (2)
10. College Division (LA, Eng., C&F, Nursing)	.53 (2)	.28	.30		.28	.50
11. Place of Residence (on campus, off campus, at home)	.32	.44 (4)	.19		.19	.33
12. Willing to demonstrate	.11	.71 (1)	.23		.27	.84 (1)
13. Faculty Liberal/Conservativeness	.31	.43	.45 (4)		.35	.10
R	.41	.47	.39	.43	0	.62
R^2	.17	.22	.15	.18	0	.39

MULTIPLE CLASSIFICATION BY COHORT

Dependent Variable: EFFICACY

Table # 2C Cohort: Class of "77"				Table # 2D Cohort: Freshman Classes of 76, 77 & 78		
Predictor List	T_1	T_2 Fr (2.08)	T_3 Soph(2.06)	T_1 Fr (2.08)	T_2 Fr (2.08)	T_3
1. Media Attention		.18	.24	.35	.18	.78 (2)
2. Father's Party Identification		.27 (2)	.28	.29	.27 (3)	.31 (4)
3. Socio-economic Status of Respondent's Family		.22 (4)	.24	.38 (4)	.22	.20
4. Political Information (Cognition		.33 (1)	.37 (3)	.45 (2)	.33 (1)	.25
5. Liberal/Conservativeness		.14	.75 (1)	.52 (1)	.14	.93 (1)
6. Efficacy		-	-	-	-	-
7. Peer Identification		.21	.16	.20	.25 (4)	.16
8. Respondent's Party ID		.25 (3)	.38 (2)	.42 (3)	.25 (4)	.24
9. Parental Social Trust		.31	.31	-	.31 (2)	.40 (3)
10. College Division (4A, Eng., C&F, Nursing)		-	.14			
11. Place of Residence (on campus off campus, at home)		-	.22			
12. Willing to demonstrate		-	.15			
13. Faculty Liberal/ Conservativeness		-	.35 (4)			
R		.21	.36	.43	.21	0
R^2		.05	.13	.18	.05	0

MULTIPLE CLASSIFICATION BY COHORT

Dependent Variable: LIBERAL/CONSERVATIVE

Table # 3A Cohort: Class of "75"				Table #3B Cohort: Class of "76"		
Predictor List	T_1 Soph(1.42)	T_2 Jr (1.38)	T_3 Sr (1.33)	T_1 Fr (1.41)	T_2 Soph(1.38)	T_3 Jr (1.27)
1. Media Attention	.10	.27	.48 (3)	.23	.25	.24
2. Father's Party Identification	.39 (3)	.39	.43 (2)	.39 (4)	.17	.43
3. Socio-economic Status of Respondent's Family	.31	.46 (3)	.50 (2)	.42 (3)	.24	.51 (2)
4. Political Information (Cognition	.37 (4)	.39	.25	.45 (2)	.42	.32
5. Liberal/Conservativeness	-	-	-	-	-	-
6. Efficacy	.22	.41	.15	.27	.19	.31
7. Peer Identification	.28	.44 (4)	.46	.12	.68 (1)	.43
8. Respondent's Party ID	.34	.55 (1)	.55 (1)	.70 (1)	.50 (4)	.56 (1)
9. Parental Social Trust	-	.39	.40	-	.34	.37
10. College Division (LA, Eng., C&F, Nursing)	.20	.26	.50 (2)		.27	.41
11. Place of Residence (on campus, off campus, at home)	.25	.16	.14		.52 (2)	.31
12. Willing to demonstrate	.41 (2)	.24	.18		.51 (3)	.31
13. Faculty Liberal/Conservativeness	.74 (1)	.47 (2)	.22		.42	.45 (3)
R	.04	0	.69	.36	.25	.38
R^2	.001	0	.48	.13	.06	.15

MULTIPLE CLASSIFICATION BY COHORT

Dependent Variable: LIBERAL/CONSERVATIVE

Table # 3C

Cohort: Class of "77"

Table #3D

Cohort: Freshmen from classes of "76", "77" "78

Predictor List	T_1	T_2 Jr (1.44)	T_3 Soph (1.39)	T_1 Fr (1.41)	T_2 Fr (1.44)	T_3 Fr
1. Media Attention		.31 (3)	.21	.23	.31 (3)	.16
2. Father's Party Identification		.83 (1)	.28	.39 (4)	.83 (1)	.36 (1)
3. Socio-economic Status of Respondent's Family		.16	.28	.42 (3)	.16	.32 (2)
4. Political Information (Cognition		.22	.32	.45 (2)	.22	.18
5. Liberal/Conservativeness		-	-	-	-	-
6. Intimacy		.24 (4)	.45 (2)	.27	.24 (4)	.16
7. Poor Identification		.19	.93 (1)	.12	.19	.25 (3)
8. Respondent's Party ID		.36 (2)	.22	.70 (1)	.36 (2)	.20
9. Parental Social Trust		.23	.35 (4)	-	.23	.24
10. College Division (AA, Eng., C&F, Nursing)			.18			
11. Place of Residence (on campus, off campus, at home)			.16			
12. Willing to demonstrate			.15			
13. Faculty Liberal/ Conservativeness			.39 (3)			
R		0	.22	.36	0	0
R^2		0	.05	.13	0	0

MULTIPLE CLASSIFICATION BY COHORT

Dependent Variable: PARTY I.D.

Table # 4A

Cohort: Class of "75"

Predictor List	T_1 Soph(2.83)	T_2 Jr (2.67)	T_3 Sr (2.69)
1. Media Attention	.12	.19	.41
2. Father's Party Identification	.53	.57 (2)	.44
3. Socio-Economic Status of Respondent's Family	.29	.19	.45
4. Political Information (Cognition)	.29	.45 (3)	.52 (4)
5. Liberal/ Conservative	.23	.18	.19
6. Efficacy	.89 (1)	.21	.33
7. Peer Identification	.16	.16	.48 (5)
8. Respondent's Party ID	-	-	-
9. Parental Social Trust	-	.40 (4)	.64 (1)
0. College Division (4A, Eng., C&F, Nursing)	.76 (3)	.19	.42
1. Place of Residence (on campus, off campus, at home)	.78 (2)	.12	.33
2. Willing to demonstrate	.71 (4)	.98 (1)	.63 (2)
3. Faculty Liberal/ Conservativeness	.54	.24	.61 (3)
R	.51	.66	.75
R^2	.26	.43	.56

Table # 4B

Cohort: Class of "76"

T_1 Fr (2.53)	T_2 Soph(2.60)	T_3 Jr(2.93)
.28 (4)	.13	.15
.48 (1)	.70 (2)	.67 (2)
.34 (2)	.19	.21
.19	.29 (4)	.33 (4)
.29 (3)	.27	.17
.28 (4)	.17	.21
.13	.98 (1)	.89 (1)
	.17	.32
	.21	.17
	.21	.19
	.31 (3)	.27
	.20	.56 (3)
.23	.50	.43
.05	.24	.19

MULTIPLE CLASSIFICATION BY COHORT

Dependent Variable: PARTY I.D.

Table # 4C

Cohort: Class of "77"

Table # 4D

Cohort: Freshmen from classes: "76", "77" and "78"

Predictor List	T_1	T_2 Fr (3.18)	T_3 Soph(3.06)	T_1 Fr (2.53)	T_2 Fr (3.18)	T_3 Fr
1. Media Attention		.22	.63 (4)	.28 (3)	.22	.15
2. Father's Party Identification		.36 (1)	.67 (3)	.48 (1)	.36 (1)	.69 (3)
3. Socio-Economic Status of Respondent's Family		.29 (3)	.22	.34 (2)	.29 (3)	.86 (2)
4. Political Information (Cognition)		.31 (2)	.33	.19	.31 (2)	.25
5. Liberal/ Conservative		.18	.23	.29 (3)	.18	.13
6. Efficacy		.20	.14	.28	.20	.11
7. Peer Identification		.16	.17	.13	.16	.27 (4)
8. Respondent's Party ID		-	-	-	-	-
9. Parental Social Trust		.29 (3)	.18	-	.29 (3)	.94 (1)
0. College Division (4A, Eng., C&F, Nursing)			.82 (2)			
1. Place of Residence (on campus, off campus, at home)			.11			
2. Willing to demonstrate			.84 (1)			
3. Faculty Liberal/ Conservativeness			.19			
R		.46	.57	.23	.46	.66
R 2		.22	.33	.05	.22	.44

MULTIPLE CLASSIFICATION BY COHORT

Dependent Variable: PREFERENCE IN "72"

Table # 5A

Cohort: Class of "75"

Predictor List	T_1 Soph(.57)	T_2 Jr (.66)	T_3 Sr (.57)
1. Media Attention	.28	.16	.33
2. Father's Party Identification	.34	.37	.53 (1)
3. Socio-economic Status of Respondent's Family	.26	.46	.43
4. Political Information (Cognition)	.50 (2)	.78 (1)	.31
5. Liberal/ Conservative	.13	.50	.15
6. Efficacy	.32	.38	.43
7. Peer Identification	.36 (4)	.47	.44 (4)
8. Respondent's Party ID	.74 (1)	.64 (4)	.47 (3)
9. Parental Social Trust	-	.69 (3)	.44 (4)
10. College Division (LA, Eng., C&F, Nursing)	.43	.73 (2)	.14
11. Place of Residence (on campus, off campus, at home)	.38 (3)	.19	.40
12. Willing to demonstrate	.25	.12	.29
13. Faculty Liberal/ Conservativeness	.13	.57	.49 (2)
R	.75	.31	0
R 2	.56	.09	0

Table # 5B

Cohort: Class of "76"

Predictor List	T_1 Fr (.55)	T_2 Soph(.66)	T_3 Jr(.57)
1. Media Attention	.49 (2)	.59 (1)	.26
2. Father's Party Identification	.39 (3)	.11	.60 (2)
3. Socio-economic Status of Respondent's Family	.38 (4)	.15	.42
4. Political Information (Cognition)	.38 (4)	.38 (3)	.50
5. Liberal/ Conservative	.41	.29 (4)	.27
6. Efficacy	.25	.27	.22
7. Peer Identification	.13	.21	.40
8. Respondent's Party ID	.80 (1)	.57 (2)	.98 (1)
9. Parental Social Trust		.18	.45
10. College Division (LA, Eng., C&F, Nursing)		.23	.52 (4)
11. Place of Residence (on campus, off campus, at home)		.22	.27
12. Willing to demonstrate		.17	.57 (3)
13. Faculty Liberal/ Conservativeness		.29 (4)	.45
R	.51	.21	0
R 2	.26	.04	0

MULTIPLE CLASSIFICATION BY COHORT

Dependent Variable: PREFERENCE IN "72"

Table # 5C

Cohort: Class of "77"

Predictor List	T_1	T_2 Fr (.67)	T_3 Soph(.60)
1. Media Attention		.73 (2)	.17
2. Father's Party Identification		.39 (3)	.30
3. Socio-Economic Status of Respondent's Family		.14	.49 (2)
4. Political Information (Cognition)		.18	.27
5. Liberal/ Conservative		.98 (1)	.21
6. Efficacy		.10	.18
7. Peer Identification		.22	.33 (4)
8. Respondent's Party ID		.39 (4)	.42 (3)
9. Parental Social Trust		.22	.22
0. College Division (LA, Eng., C&F, Nursing)			.16
1. Place of Residence (on campus, off campus, at home)			.30
12. Willing to demonstrate			.10
13. Faculty Liberal/ Conservativeness			.51 (1)
R		.44	0
R 2		.19	0

Table # 5D

Cohort: Freshman from classes "76" "77" & "78"

Predictor List	T_1 Fr (.55)	T_2 Fr (.67)	T_3
1. Media Attention	.49 (2)	.73 (2)	.11
2. Father's Party Identification	.39 (4)	.39 (3)	.36 (3)
3. Socio-Economic Status of Respondent's Family	.38	.14	.23 (3)
4. Political Information (Cognition)	.38	.18	.23 (3)
5. Liberal/ Conservative	.45 (3)	.98 (1)	.22 (4)
6. Efficacy	.25	.10	.15
7. Peer Identification	.13	.22	.23 (3)
8. Respondent's Party ID	.80 (1)	.39 (3)	.37 (1)
9. Parental Social Trust	-	.22	.18
0. College Division (LA, Eng., C&F, Nursing)			
1. Place of Residence (on campus, off campus, at home)			
12. Willing to demonstrate			
13. Faculty Liberal/ Conservativeness			
R	.51	.44	.31
R 2	.26	.19	.10

TABLE # 6

"R^2" % of Variation Explained by Each Predictor List for each Dependent Variable at each Time of Measurement for each Cohort

Cohort	T_1	T_2	T_3
EFFICACY			
"75"	.17	.22	.15
"76"	.18	.00	.39
"77"		.05	.13
"78"			.00
LIBERAL/CONSERVATIVE			
"75"	.01	.00	.48
"76"	.13	.06	.15
"77"		.00	.05
"78"			.00
PARTY IDENTIFICATION			
"75"	.26	.43	.56
"76"	.05	.24	.19
"77"		.22	.33
"78"			.44
CANDIDATE PREFERENCES IN "72"			
"75"	.56	.09	.00
"76"	.26	.04	.00
"77"		.19	.00
"78"			.10

FOOTNOTES

1. Renshon (1973) makes a persuasive empirical case for this point of view. For further support see also Entman, Prothro and Sharp (1974).

2. Among some of the recent work dealing explicitly with the relationship of personality variables to the study of political learning and behavior is Renshon, (1974); Knutson, (1972) and Schwartz (1973).

3. Searing, et. al., (1974 - Footnote 34, p. 41) have noted that "cohort analysis is prone to underestimate actual attitude change. Since it does not treat the same individuals across time it is blind to changes hidden by cancelling out effects". This fact might explain the discrepancy between our results and those of Entman, Prothro and Sharp (1974) who employ a panel technique.

4. Hann & Green, (1974). For a discussion of this see Hahn & Green (1974)

5. The questions and scoring for this scale are as follows:

When I was young, my parents:	Very often	regularly	rarely
warned me to beware of strangers	0	1	2
taught me that home was the safest place to be	0	1	2
urged me to play only with my brothers or sisters or kids who lived next door	0	1	2
told me never to accept rides from people I didn't know	0	1	2

6. This view would explain Weissberg's (1973) findings (footnoted earlier) that despite efficacy induced action with negative outcomes, efficacy remains high. The data also supports Piaget's (1970) theories that the individuals' cognitive adaptation to the environment is a continuous and cumulative process. The cognitive map at any given time accounts for how an individual organizes experience. Given that organization an individual can change the cognitive input to fit the map or adjust the map to accord with the input. This data would also support Merelman (1971) who suggests that no single existing developmental model can account for political socialization.

7. For an example of the results of mixing specific and general questions see Entman, Prothro and Sharp (1974, p. 40) and note that general questions such as #'s 2 (on the whole public official can rarely be trusted, they are almost always willing to lie to protect themselves) 4, 5, 7, 8 and 9 show little variation whereas specific questions such as 1 (while minor officials are often guilty of dishonesty in the government it is safe to say that high officials such as cabinet officers and the president himself are about as trustworthy as people can be); 3 and 6 are the kinds of question(s) that particularly in the face of Watergate information would make it difficult for the respondent not to change his point of view. Questions 1, 3 and 6 are close to tapping opinions rather than attitudes and thus are less likely to measure deeply socialized orientations such as social trust. They are also the questions which cause the dimension, social trust, to be unstable.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Adelson, J. "The Political Imagination of the Young Adolescent", Daedulus 100 (1971), 1013-1050.

2. Andrews, Frank, M.; Morgan, James, N. and Sonquist, John. A Multiple Classification Analysis, Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1967.

3. Converse, Phillip, "The Nature of Belief System in Mass Public", in D. Apter (ed.) Ideology & Discontent, New York, The Free Press, 1964.

4. Cutler, N. E. "Generation - Maturation and Party Affiliation : A Cohort Analysis" Public Opinion Quarterly, 33 (1969/70)

5. _____. "Toward a Generational Conception of Political Socialization" in Schwartz & Schwartz, eds. New Direction in Political Socialization, New York, The Free Press, 1975, 254-288.

6. Dobson, D. and St. Angelo, D. "Party Identification and the Floating Vote : Some Dynamics", APSR, Vol. LXIX, June, 1975, pp. 481-490.

7. Easton, D. and Jack Dennis. "The Child's Acquisition of Regime Norms : Political Efficacy", APSR, 6 (1967), 25-38.

8. Entman, Robert, James W. Prothro, Edward F. Sharp. "The Mass Media, Dissonant Events and Alienation : A Panel Study of the Effect of the Watergate Scandals on Political Attitudes," (1974).

9. Festinger, L. A. A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance, Stanford, Stanford Univ. Press, 1957.

10. Garrett, James, B. and Wallance, Benjamin. "Attitudes on Watergate : A Search for Significant Determinants". Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Annual Meeting, New Orleans, Sept., 1974.

11. Green, Justin, J. "Social Backgrounds, Attitudes and Political Behavior - A Study of a Philippine Elite", Southeast Asia Quarterly, Vol. 2, No. 3, Summer, 1973.

12. Greenstein, Fred. Children & Politics, New Haven, Yale Univ. Press, 1965.

13. _____. "The Benevolent Leader Revisited : Children's Images of Political Leaders in Three Democracies", Forthcoming, APSR.

14. Greenstein, F. and Tarrow, L. "Political Orientations of Children : The Case of a Semi-Projective Technique in Three Nations", Sage Professional Papers in Comparative Politics, No. 01-009, 1971.

15. Hess, Robert and J. Torney. The Development of Political Attitudes in Children, New York, Doubleday, 1967.

16. Hyman, H. Political Socialization, Glencoe: The Free Press, 1959.

17. Knutson, Jeanne. The Human Basis of the Polity, Chicago, Aldine, 1972.

18. Lambert, T. A. "Generational Factors in Political-Cultural Consciousness", Paper Prepared for the Annual Meeting of the APSA, Chicago, 1971.

19. Langton, Kenneth, P. Political Socialization, New York : Oxford Univ. Press, 1969.

20. Lupfer, Michael & Kenny, Charles. "Children's Reactions to the President Pre- and Post-Watergate Findings. Paper presented at the 1974 Annual Meeting of the APSA. Palmer House, Chicago, 8/29 to 9/2, 1974.

21. McClain, J. Dudley. "Trust, Efficacy and Alienation Among College Students in the American South : Before & After the 1972 Election and Watergate".

22. Merelman, R. M. "The Development of Political Ideology : A Framework for the Analysis of Political Socialization", APSA LXIII (Sept. 1967), pp. 750-767.

23. _____. Political Socialization and Educational Climates, N.Y., Holt Rinehart & Winston, 1971.

24. Piaget, J. "Piaget's Theory" in P. H. Nussen (ed.), Carmichael's Manual of Child Psychology I (third edition), New York, Wiley, 1970.

25. Renshon, Stanley, A. Psychological Needs & Political Behavior, N.Y., Free Press, 1974.

26. Riley, M. W. "Aging & Cohort Succession : Interpretation and Misinterpretation", P.O.Q., 37 (1973), pp. 35-49.

27. Searing, Donald, D. Wright, Gerald, C. & Rabinowitz, George B. "The Primacy Principle - Attitude Change and Political Socialization. Unpublished Paper - Mimeo. University of North Carolina.

28. Schaie, K. Warner. "A General Model for the Study of Developmental Problems", Psychological Bulletin, 1965, Vol. 64, No. 2, pp. 92-107.

29. Smith, M. B. "A Map for the Analysis of Personality & Politics", Journal of Social Issues, XXIV, 3, (July, 1968), 15-23.

30. _____. "Political Attitudes" in Handbook of Political Psychology, Jeanne Knutson, ed. Josey-Bass, San Francisco, 1973, pp. 57-82.

31. Vaillancourt, Paulina, M. "The Stability of Children Survey Response", Public Opinion Quarterly, 37 (1973) pp. 373-87.

32. Weissberg, Robert. Political Learning, Political Choice & Democratic Citizenship, Prentice-Hall, 1974.

33. _____. "Political Efficacy & Political Illusion", Journal of Politics, May 1975, pp. 469-487.